

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
5

6 RAY SHARPE,
7 Plaintiff(s),
8 v.
9 RUIZ, et al.,
10 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:22-cv-01624-MMD-NJK

Order

11 Concurrently herewith, the Court is entering a blanket protective order to facilitate
12 discovery in this case. This order reminds counsel that there is a presumption of public access to
13 judicial files and records. A party seeking to file a confidential document under seal must file a
14 motion to seal and must comply with the Ninth Circuit's directives in *Kamakana v. City and*
15 *County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006).

16 The Court has adopted electronic filing procedures. Attorneys must file documents under
17 seal using the Court's electronic filing procedures. *See Local Rule IA 10-5.* Papers filed with the
18 Court under seal must be accompanied with a concurrently-filed motion for leave to file those
19 documents under seal. *See Local Rule IA 10-5(a).*

20 The Court has approved the blanket protective order to facilitate discovery exchanges. But
21 **there has been no showing, and the Court has not found, that any specific documents are**
22 **secret or confidential.** The parties have not provided specific facts supported by declarations or
23 concrete examples to establish that a protective order is required to protect any specific trade secret
24 or other confidential information pursuant to Rule 26(c) or that disclosure would cause an
25 identifiable and significant harm. The Ninth Circuit has held that there is a presumption of public
26 access to judicial files and records, and that parties seeking to maintain the confidentiality of
27 documents attached to nondispositive motions must show good cause exists to overcome the
28 presumption of public access. *See Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179. Parties seeking to maintain the


1 secrecy of documents attached to dispositive motions must show compelling reasons sufficient to
 2 overcome the presumption of public access. *Id.* at 1180. **All motions to seal must address the**
 3 **applicable standard and explain why that standard has been met.** The fact that a court has
 4 entered a blanket protective order and that a party has designated a document as confidential
 5 pursuant to that protective order does not, standing alone, establish sufficient grounds to seal a
 6 filed document. *See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th Cir. 2003);
 7 *see also Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992).

8 If the sole ground for a motion to seal is that the opposing party (or non-party) has
 9 designated a document as confidential, the designator shall file (within seven days of the filing of
 10 the motion to seal) either (1) a declaration establishing sufficient justification for sealing each
 11 document at issue or (2) a notice of withdrawal of the designation(s) and consent to unsealing. If
 12 neither filing is made, the Court may order the document(s) unsealed without further notice.

13 **IT IS ORDERED** that counsel shall comply with the requirements of Local Rule IA 10-
 14 5, the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d 1172, and the procedures outlined above,
 15 with respect to any documents filed under seal. To the extent any aspect of the blanket protective
 16 order may conflict with this order or Local Rule IA 10-5, that aspect of the blanket protective order
 17 is hereby superseded with this order.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: May 10, 2024

20 
 21 Nancy J. Koppe
 22 United States Magistrate Judge

23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28